

Meeting Summary
Delaware Geographic Data Committee
May 19, 2000
Grassdale Conference Center – Delaware City

Attendance List:*

Vincent Rucinski – DelDOT	Michael Townsend – DE SHPO
Jennifer Campagnini – DEMA	Howard Lowell – Archives
Don Berry – DHSS	Peter Owusu-Donkur – Kent County MPO
David S. Hugg, III – Office of State Planning Coordination	David Beattie – City of Wilmington
Michael B. Mahaffie – Office of State Planning Coordination	Eric Swanson – EIS
Dorothy Morris – Office of State Planning Coordination	Tom Gergez – EIS
Dennis Murphy – DNREC	Steve Lee – City of Dover
Sandy Schenck – Delaware Geological Survey	Dave Gula – Delaware Transit Authority
Tim Westbrook – New Castle County	Heather Comstock – OIS
Jeff Bergstrom – City of New Castle	Tripp Fischer – DNREC
Miriam Pomilio – DNREC, Parks	Patrick Susi – New Castle County
	Michael Marinelli – New Castle County
	Karissa Hendershot – DNREC, SIRB

Welcome and Introductions

Mike Mahaffie led a quick, “round the room,” set of introductions, explaining that some members may be new to the group. Each attendee identified who they were and where they were from.

Information Updates

Mike stated that he has added new attribute data to the [municipal boundaries data file](#).

Sandy stated that he was working on a new "data sharing" website.

Mike stated that Heather, from OIS, has been working on a Geocoding Project with DelDOT and Public Safety. She stated that she got all the requirements together and sent them out to two vendors. She noted that she is still waiting for one of the vendors to respond. The vendor that has responded has given her an estimate of \$132,000 but that does not include the licensing that will be needed. To include the licensing would be an additional \$150-200,000. Heather stated that it might be time to look at a statewide license.

It was discussed that the finished product would be a “box” housed at OIS and accessible through the web so that any state agency could type in an address and get latitude/longitude coordinates.

Don Berry stated that the project would have to yield a product that would increase the number of correct hits received. He stated that he has a system that was much cheaper but the failure rate was often 40%.

Tim Westbrook asked where the data would come from. Eric stated that it would come from the 911 information and Tim stated that the latitude/longitude coordinates were not available for all addresses right now. Eric stated that that was true but as information gets better, so will the system.

Mike stated that this new system would be a start and working with this system will only make it better.

* This list is based on the sign-in sheets filled in at the meeting. If you remember someone who was there whom we missed, please let us know. In addition, we may have hideously disfigured the spelling of your name (unless you have meticulous handwriting). If we have, please inform us, and forgive us, and we'll correct our error.

It was stated that Oracle had gone through some changes and that, as a result, licensing charges might go up considerably. Mike noted that it might be time to begin pursuing a state license again and that OIS should take the lead on it. Sandy said to keep the University in mind because they get an educational discount.

Dennis Murphy stated that he thought a program could be gotten cheaper and asked why we were going with Oracle. Tim stated that it was because the State Police data and DelDOT data are already in Oracle.

Tim stated that the best place to start for information is with the counties and municipalities. Dennis asked if there had been any agreement reached between the counties and the state. Mike stated that he was not aware of any. Tim stated that New Castle County will give the information they have but they only have address ranges.

Dennis asked what kind of mechanisms had been set up to get road information from the counties. Vince stated that there was nothing formal yet but they were working on it. Mike asked if DelDOT was going to address this or if they needed facilitators. Vince stated that any help would be great. Mike stated that maybe OSPC could give them a hand and work on a memorandum of understanding.

Sandy stated that as the chairman of SMAC he would call the utility companies and see if they had addresses geocoded.

Mike stated that the GIS Conference was to be held at the Sheraton Dover Hotel on November 17th. More information will follow.

Committee Report – Data Sharing Issues

Mike referred everyone to a matrix ([attached](#)) that shows the issues identified by the committee. Mike stated that the issues were broken down into three parts – legal issues, framework issues and administrative needs.

Don Berry stated that data sharing should be free because he figures that the State has paid his salary when he researches the data so therefore he has been paid for his research work. Sandy stated that the committee might need to speak to a Budget office representative and get their position on the issue of data sharing.

Mike stated that the Data Sharing Committee would continue to work through these issues. Mike also noted that the Framework layers should be completed by the August meeting and will come back to this committee for recommendation.

Project Proposals – Graphic Orthophotomaps (USGS)

Sandy stated that the USGS has proposed using a combination of ortho-rectified photos and GIS data layers to make a combination map/photo – known as an Orthophotomap. They would like to do a pilot project with Delaware as a data-sharing project; we would give them the 1997 photos and some data and guidance and they would provide paper product versions of the Orthophotomaps. SMAC has discussed this proposal and supports the idea. Sandy stated that a committee would need to be appointed to come up with the list of what should be portrayed on the map.

Steve Lee asked if we could get it digitally. Sandy stated that he could negotiate for that but he was unsure at this point. Mike asked for a motion that Sandy pursue as a pilot program but negotiate anything else that we want with the understanding that we may have to pay for some of what we want.

Dennis asked how long it would take to be completed and Sandy said approximately 3 years. Dennis asked if we could go forward for now and then use the 2002 photos. Sandy stated that that would not be possible.

Tim Westbrook stated that he was not in favor of paying for anything because by the time we get the information we will have new photos.

A motion was made by Mike Mahaffie and seconded by Steve Lee that we pursue the pilot program as long as it is free and can be done relatively quickly. Those members present unanimously approved this motion.

Project Proposal Discussions – Next Round of Digital Aerial photos

Mike went over the draft proposal ([attached](#)). Dennis stated that the RFP does not include plans for online distribution. Dennis feels we should make it available to public. Sandy stated that this was a point to negotiate when the RFP was done, but that some form of distribution is anticipated. Dennis stated that the proposal should show optional language to include data sharing. Dennis stated that if the RFP or the contract states that the information is to be used by the State then a DelDOT contractor would have to pay for the information. Vince stated that he has to spend time/money to give the information out to the public now and if we went through a contractor and they controlled the information then the public could go through them.

Tim stated that these points could be negotiated later but that we needed to make sure it was in the budget first. Mike stated that he would take the proposal to the CCSPI next week. Howard Lowell stated that the proposal should make the CCSPI aware of what will happen if we don't have these done.

Vince stated that the money should come from the operating budget so we should ask for so much per year – not a one-time cost.

A motion was made by Mike Mahaffie, seconded by Mike Townsend and unanimously approved by the members present to take the proposal to the Cabinet Committee on State Planning Issues and start the process of trying to get it into the budget for FY 2002.

State Boundary Overview

Sandy gave an overview of how the State boundaries came to be and where they are located. He stated that there is no official data layer but he has the latitude and longitude for existing boundary markers.

On Line mapping capabilities for small agencies

Mike asked if there were any interest in pursuing finding tool that would help serve data on the internet for small agencies. It was agreed that this is a topic that should be discussed in the future.

Mike stated that the next meeting would be August 18th and that he would notify everyone of the time and place.

Data Sharing Issues Identified by members of the DGDC Data-Sharing Issues Committee
Friday, April 14, 2000

Issue	Legal	Framework	Administrative Needs
FOIA	“What is public?”	Using framework to provide standard data	Settle question of “Who owns what?”
Cost Recovery/ Charging for Data	Definition of what costs can be recovered	Framework should allow costs to be shared in some cases	Training in FOIA cost-recovery rules
Commercial Re-Sale	“What is public?” and what are the gradations of public	Framework layers should be very public and not liable to resale	Clear identification of “public” data sets
Duplication of Effort		Set clear responsibility for who maintains what	Communication of “ownership”
Metadata/ Clearinghouse	Legal requirements under HB395	Ensure that Framework layers have metadata	Assistance/oversight/dunning
Need for a Data Index Site		Base index on Framework layers	Bring Framework committee back together
Data transfer to a 3 rd party	Establish standard, clear data restrictions?	Send requestors to Clearinghouse site or Index site	Maintaining Index, promoting Clearinghouse
Data Ownership	Data management considerations Data update requirements	Framework layers will be the first for which we establish “ownership”	Assistance to data owners
Outdated State Code references	Code review		Determine who should review
Data Authenticity	Relates to “ownership issue”	Use clearinghouse to establish public knowledge of ownership	Cross-agency support and respect for Data ownership
Training/Education		Base training in Data use of Framework layers?	Support for Training and Education
Data-Sharing Strategy	Build on HB395 to establish “culture of sharing”	Use Framework to establish a base set of shared data	Promote framework and “culture of sharing”

Delaware Orthophotography Updates

A Proposal From the Delaware Geographic Data Committee

Background

In 1984, 1992, and 1997, different state government agencies, acting alone or in small groups, funded projects to produce aerial photography of the state. These projects produced full sets of photographs of the state, divided into sections (“quarter quads”) that approximated a quarter of each of the United States Geological Survey (USGS) quadrangles that cover Delaware.

These photos have been used to support a wide range of state activities, including transportation planning, land use planning and research, land preservation, environmental protection, development of spatial data sets for use with Geographic Information System (GIS) software, and traditional mapping. These photos have also been used to help in the development of cadastral mapping (parcel mapping) and other projects, by local jurisdictions.

For each of these years, for example, the photography has been analyzed to develop a GIS data layer of land use and land cover. These data sets have been compared, in several studies, to produce information on how Delaware’s land uses are changing. These studies have been helpful in guiding state and local policy decisions.

Need

Despite the wide range of utility this type of data, there is presently no regular schedule of updates to this data set. Nor is there a general policy for funding such data sets. As a result, the data-using community has had to depend on the transitional needs of different agencies to spur the development of data updates.

It is generally agreed among the GIS community – as represented by the Delaware Geographic Data Committee (DGDC), which includes representatives from state, county and local governments as well as academia and the private sector – that Delaware should establish funding for, and a process to ensure the management and wide distribution of, a regularly updated set of aerial photographs or their equivalent.

The next set of photos should be taken no later than the spring of 2002, to maintain the five-year cycle begun by the 1992 and 1997 data sets. Most data users agree that it would be preferable to eventually establish a three-year cycle.

The photos should be at a scale and a resolution sufficient to allow their use by county and local governments in maintaining accurate cadastral maps. It is anticipated that the provision of such photography will be considered state assistance to local governments in maintaining these maps and that the resulting cadastral data sets will be freely available to state, county and municipal government agencies.

Proposal

The Delaware Geographic Data Committee (DGDC) should prepare a Request For Proposals (RFP) outlining the needs and requirements of the project, as set forth in this proposal. That RFP should be distributed to the vendor community, which will be asked to present proposals to meet the needs expressed by the DGDC.

Based on those proposals, the DGDC should make a request, working with the State Budget Office, for funding in the fiscal year 2002 operating budget to pursue the project.

The DGDC has discussed several different funding approaches for this sort of project. It is preferred that the funding be a part of the operating budget. It has been suggested that the project should be a multi-year

effort, involving several rounds of data updates over a number of years. For example, the photography and interpretation projects might be placed in adjacent budget years.

Additionally, it is possible that the federal government might be brought into the project as a partner. This might mean helping to fund the project, or using the final product as input, and in-kind contribution, for some future data development based on the new aerial photography. In the past, Delaware has had success in partnerships of this type with the USGS, working through the Delaware Geological Survey.

“Broad Outlines” of An RFP

Product – The end result of the project should be a set of geo-registered digital orthophoto files (Geo-TIFF’s or their equivalent). These files should be presented in a format that fits logically within, or can be matched to, the USGS quadrangle system.

Photography – The data gathered must be collected in such a way that the clearest possible picture of ground conditions is shown. If project proposals include aerial photography, for example, that photography shall be in a “leaf-off” period, to ensure a clear picture, uninhibited by vegetative canopy.

Distribution – The project proposed should result in both paper and digital photography that is fully and freely available to state agencies and to county and local governments and is fully publicly accessible. The DGDC shall prepare a complete list of agencies at all levels of government that must have free access to the product. It is possible that the proposals might include plans for on-line distribution of and/or access to the photography.

Projection – The product should be geo-referenced within the Delaware State Plane Coordinate System, as outlined in Title 6, Chapter 55, §5502(b), of the Delaware State Code.

Scale -- As stated above, the photos should be at a scale and a resolution sufficient to allow their use by county and local governments in maintaining accurate cadastral maps. This should be a scale of 1:2400 in rural and less heavily developed portions of the state, and 1:1200 in urban areas and incorporated places.

Interpretation – Photo-interpretation should be a part of the proposal. The photography should be interpreted to produce a data set that can be compared to previous land use and land cover data sets.

Color – Proposals should include separate pricing for color and black and white photography. The DGDC would like to be able to at least consider purchasing color photography, if it is not prohibitively expensive.